

REMARKS

Prior to the entry of this paper, claims 1-29 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended herein. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, following the entry of the above amendments, claims 1-29 will be at issue in the application. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

The 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, the Examiner asserts that the phrase “at least partially simultaneously” renders the claims indefinite. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended to more clearly point out the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, it is submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-7, 10-16, 19-24 and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,009 to Chapel (hereinafter referred to as “Chapel”) in view of European Patent EP324376 to Kobel (hereinafter referred to as “Kobel”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 is directed to a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus, and comprises a combination of elements, including, for example: “a plurality of separate power information visual display sections disposed in the power distribution housing with at least one power information visual display section being associated with at least said one power output and at least a second power information visual display section being associated with at least said second power output,” and “whereby at the power distribution housing (i) said one power information visual display section can report visible first phase information regarding said one power phase provided through said one power output, while (ii) said second power information visual display section reports visible second phase information regarding said second power phase provided through said second power output.”

As the Office Action acknowledges at 3, Chapel does not teach or suggest any type of power information visual display sections, much less the type claimed or within the environment of the power information visual display sections disposed in a power distribution housing apparatus and associated with power outputs, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action cited Kobel for such a disclosure.

The applicants respectfully submit that these references are not properly combinable, as will be discussed in more detail below. Even assuming, *arguendo*, Chapel and Kobel are properly combinable, it is submitted that Kobel does not cure the deficiencies of Chapel. Although the Office Action relies upon Kobel for a three-phase measuring device, neither Kobel nor Chapel disclose separate power information visual display sections as claimed: [a] "disposed in the power distribution housing" and [b] "at the power distribution housing (i) said one power information visual display section can report visible first phase information regarding said one power phase provided through said one power output, while (ii) said second power information visual display section reports visible second phase information regarding said second power phase provided through said second power output." The Office Action does not assert otherwise. Thus, the asserted combination of Chapel and Kobel, even if the combination were proper, would not yield the claimed subject matter. The asserted combination therefore could not render the claimed subject matter obvious as a matter of law under Section 103.

As indicated above, it is respectfully submitted that Kobel and Chapel are not properly combinable, and therefore cannot render the claimed polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus obvious.

Chapel is directed to a rack in which equipment may be mounted and powered by a polyphase power distribution system. *See* Abstract. Chapel discloses that it is desirable to balance the loads on the individual phases. *See* col. 1, lines 13-15. As illustrated in Fig. 1, and described at col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 19, the rack of Chapel includes electrical outlets on each side of an equipment bay. The outlets on different sides of each bay are interconnected with different phases of a power source, and as the rack is fully populated with equipment, each phase of the power source will be loaded in a balanced fashion. Thus, by configuring a rack in such a fashion there is no need to monitor any information related to any particular phase because each phase will be properly balanced naturally as equipment is loaded into the rack. Chapel also goes on to state, at col. 5, lines 14-15, that "no more than four loads in one rack will

be connected to any one phase supplied by the same source.” In such a manner, Chapel provides that no one phase in the system will become overloaded.

Kobel is directed to an overcurrent trip system that is used in a three phase power system. In the event that an overcurrent condition occurs, the current of different phases is reported on a different display for each phase. The information from each particular phase, at the time of the overcurrent condition, may then be used for error analysis. *See* page 5.

The Office Action, at page 3, states that the overcurrent trip system of Kobel, in combination with Chapel, would provide separate visual displays for each phase of a power distribution system. The Office Action goes on to state that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the overcurrent trip system of Kobel in the invention of Chapel “to provide reliable analysis if a fault occurs.” However, as discussed, the system of Chapel is specifically configured to provide balanced loading of different power phases, thus eliminating any need for monitoring as suggested in the Office Action. Furthermore, Chapel specifically states that the number of loads connected to any one load is limited, which will prevent any one phase from becoming overloaded and causing an overcurrent condition. Thus, the system of Chapel is specifically designed to provide balanced loads and to prevent overcurrent conditions, and therefore is not properly combinable with Kobel in the manner as suggested in the Office Action.

Additionally, it is submitted that Chapel actually teaches away from a combination with Kobel. This indicates that the combination of Chapel and Kobel was, in fact, not obvious to one skilled in the art.

As discussed above, Chapel is directed to a rack in which equipment may be mounted and powered by a polyphase power distribution system. Chapel describes at col. 1, lines 25-33, that, traditionally, load balancing had been achieved through a time consuming process that required keeping an accounting of the power requirements of all the loads on each phase and wiring or re-wiring loads to provide load balancing. Chapel goes on to state, at col. 1 lines 35-37, that an object of the invention is to provide a simple means to achieve load balancing without such accounting of power requirements and wiring or re-wiring of loads. Chapel, as described above, then describes how this object of the invention is achieved by providing a rack in which phases are balanced as a rack is populated with equipment. Kobel, as described above, provides a overcurrent trip system that provides indications of current at power phases in the event of an

overcurrent condition. Thus, Kobel provides information related to different phases, which is precisely the type of information that Chapel desired to eliminate.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Chapel actually teaches away from a combination as suggested by the Examiner. As discussed in MPEP § 2145, it is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination, citing *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The asserted combination therefore could not render the claimed subject matter obvious as a matter of law under Section 103.

Furthermore, it is submitted that the claimed subject matter is also allowable because the references fail to teach or suggest the advantages that flow from the claimed invention. In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under section 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed "subject matter as a whole" would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 71 3 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 71 3 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Advantages of claimed subject matter are a part of the subject matter as a whole under section 103. "The invention as a whole embraces the structure, its properties [advantages], and the problem it solves [advantages it provides]." *In re Wright*, 84 F.2d 1216 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Advantages need not be included in the specification. *In re Chu*, 66 F.3d 292 (Fed Cir 1995). "In delineating the invention as a whole, we look not only to the subject matter which is literally recited in the claim in question . . . but also to those properties of the subject matter which are inherent in the subject matter and are disclosed in the specification." *In re Antoine*, 559 F.2d 618, 691 (CCPA 1977).

Thus, "[t]he relevance of such evidence [i.e., of advantages] is direct [under Section 103] in the sense that the new function [i.e., provided by an advantage] is a part of the inventive concept, the 'subject as a whole,' which must be obvious under Section 103." Chisum, *Intellectual Property, Copyright, and Trademark*, 7- 103, 104 (1980) (cited in Chisum's treatise on Patents at Section 5.03 [5]). Advantages are also inferential evidence of non-obviousness as part of the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art to be considered under the analysis articulated in *Graham v. John Deere Co. In re Dillon*, 991 F.2d 688 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied 500 U.S. 904 (1991).

When applicable, the applicants' discovery of a problem to be solved also is part of the subject matter as a whole and differences between the claimed subject matter and prior art. *Eibel*

Process Co. v. Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co., 261 U.S. 45, 67-78 (1923). "[A] patentable invention may lie in the discovery of a source of a problem even though the remedy may be obvious once the source of a problem is identified. This is part of the 'subject matter as a whole' which should always be considered in determining the obviousness of an invention under 35 U.S.C. Section 103. . . ." *In re Spinnoble*, 405 F.2d 578, 585-86 (CCPA 1969).

One exemplary advantage of the claimed subject matter is the ability to monitor "at the power distribution housing," through the claimed "power information visual display sections" disposed in the "power distribution housing," "visible first phase information regarding said one power phase provided through said one power output" and "visible second phase information regarding said second power phase provided through said second power output." See Claim 1. Previously, similar systems had only "a single current display visible to an operator along the face of the plugstrip in which the outputs are also mounted." Specification at para. [0010]. As the Specification further states, at para. [0011]: "another problem with this type of prior art system is that it requires the operator to take the time and effort to stop whatever the operator may be doing, turn attention to the plugstrip, and press the display button on the plugstrip to cycle through and observe the current indicators for the various phases."

The applicants submit that they were the first to discover the underlying problem created by the pre-existing, long-standing need for an operator to have to deal with a single current display along the face of a plugstrip and the time and effort needed to press a display button to see information for each phase, such information only being cycled through and never displayed at the same time. Thus, the applicants then developed the claimed subject matter to provide novel advantages by use of the claimed subject matter (i) to monitor information related to more than one power phase by looking only at the power distribution housing and (ii) without need for additional equipment of the prior art systems in the claimed environment.

The Office Action does not cite any of these factors - the applicants' discovery of the problem to be solved or the resulting advantages as part of the claimed subject matter as a whole under Section 103. On the contrary, the Office Action acknowledges undefined advantages of the claimed subject matter but does not acknowledge the source of the advantages being the applicants' specification, not the cited references (see Office Action, page 3). The Office Action thus does not establish *prima facie* obviousness, as it did not consider the applicants' discovery and the advantages as part of the claimed subject matter as a whole. Moreover, as discussed

above, since these aspects of the claimed subject matter as a whole are not taught or suggested by the asserted references, the claimed subject matter as a whole is allowable over the references as a matter of law.

In addition, the applicants note that Kobel was first published on July 19, 1989 – more than a decade before the applicants' priority date of October 30, 2003. The applicants submit that such a sizeable timeframe, particularly given the rapid pace of technological development in the past twenty years, provides yet further evidence of nonobviousness of the applicants' claimed invention to those skilled in the art. Had it been so obvious to somehow combine the cited references, including by making the requisite substantial modifications in them, to yield the claimed subject matter, then why is it that nobody has done so in the more than fourteen years since Kobel has been publicly available? The applicants thus respectfully submit that the Office Action's asserted combination would not only yield less than the claimed subject matter as a whole but also is the result of the improper application of hindsight in assessing that subject matter. *Ecolochem, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.*, 227 F.3d 1361, 1372, 56 USPQ2d 1065, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Moreover, was such an analysis proper, the applicants submit that every advantageous invention would be unpatentable.

In sum, claim 1 is allowable as a matter of law because of the lack of a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming a *prima facie* case, the applicants have still rebutted the conclusion of obviousness based on the asserted combination's inability to yield the claimed subject matter, the improper combination of references, the applicants' discovery of the problem to be solved, and the absence of any teaching or suggestion of the advantages of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly the applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn from independent claim 1 and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim 2

Dependent claim 2 depends from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest any type of current determination circuits disposed in a power distribution housing, much less "wherein said one power information visual display section comprises a first phase current visual

display section and said second power information visual display section comprises a second phase current visual display section and wherein the apparatus also includes a plurality of current determination circuits disposed in the power distribution housing with: (i) one current determination circuit intermediate said first phase current visual display section and said one power output; and (ii) a second current determination circuit intermediate said second phase current visual display section and said second power output," as recited by dependent claim 2. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claim 3

Dependent claim 3 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a housing that includes at least one vertical rack mounting element, much less a power distribution housing that "is elongated and includes at least one vertical rack mounting element whereby the elongated housing may be mounted to extend vertically adjacent an equipment rack," as recited by dependent claim 3. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 3 be withdrawn.

Claim 4

Dependent claim 4 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein (i) said plurality of power outputs includes at least a third power output being in power supply communication with a third power phase provided by the polyphase power input; and (ii) said plurality of power information visual display sections includes a third power information visual display section associated with said third power output," as recited by dependent claim 4. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claim 5

Dependent claim 5 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein (i) said plurality of power outputs includes at least a third power output being in power supply communication with a third power phase provided by the polyphase power input; (ii) said plurality of power information visual display sections includes a third power information visual display section, comprising a third current visual display section, associated with said third power output; and (iii) said plurality of current determination circuits includes a third current determination circuit intermediate said third phase current visual display section and said third power output," as recited by dependent claim 5. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claim 6

Dependent claim 6 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral information monitor, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein the polyphase power input includes a neutral line and the plurality of power information visual display sections includes a neutral information visual display section associated with the neutral line," as recited by dependent claim 6. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 7

Dependent claim 7 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral information monitor, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein the polyphase power input

includes a neutral line and the plurality of power information visual display sections includes a neutral information visual display section, comprising a neutral current visual display section, associated with the neutral line," as recited by dependent claim 7. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claim 10

Independent claim 10 is directed to a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus, and comprises a combination of elements, including, for example: "a plurality of separate power information visual display sections disposed in the power distribution housing with at least one power information visual display section being associated with said plurality of first phase power outputs and a second power information visual display section being associated with said plurality of second phase power outputs; whereby at the power distribution housing (i) said one power information visual display section can display information regarding first phase power provided through said plurality of first power phase power outputs, while (ii) said second power information visual display section displays information regarding second phase power provided through said plurality of second phase power outputs."

It is submitted that the combination of Chapel and Kobel, similarly as discussed above, does not render claim 10 obvious. As discussed above, Chapel is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any type of power information visual display sections, let alone the type claimed or within the environment of the power information visual display sections disposed in the power distribution apparatus associated with a plurality of polyphase power outputs, as claimed.

As also discussed above, Chapel and Kobel are not properly combinable, because one of skill in the art, based on the teachings of these references, would not be motivated to combine these references. Furthermore, Chapel actually *teaches away* from visual display of power information.

In addition, similarly as discussed above, the claimed subject matter is allowable because the references fail to teach or suggest the advantages that flow from the claimed invention. The applicants submit that they were the first to discover the underlying problem created by the pre-existing, long-standing need for an operator to have to deal with a single current display along the face of a plugstrip and the time and effort needed to press a display button to see information for each phase, such information only being cycled through and never displayed at the same

time. Thus, the applicants then developed the claimed subject matter to provide novel advantages by use of the claimed subject matter (i) to monitor information related to more than one power phase by looking only at the power distribution housing and (ii) without need for additional equipment of the prior art systems in the claimed environment. It is thus further submitted that the Office Action does not establish *prima facie* obviousness, as it did not consider the applicants' discovery and the advantages as part of the claimed subject matter as a whole. Moreover, as discussed above, since these aspects of the claimed subject matter as a whole are not taught or suggested by the asserted references, the claimed subject matter as a whole is allowable over the references as a matter of law.

Furthermore, similarly as discussed above, Kobel was first published on July 19, 1989 – more than a decade before the applicants' priority date of October 30, 2003. The applicants submit that such a sizeable timeframe, particularly given the rapid pace of technological development in the past twenty years, provides yet further evidence of nonobviousness of the applicants' claimed invention to those skilled in the art.

In sum, claim 10 is allowable because the combination of Chapel and Kobel do not render the claim obvious. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn from independent claim 10 and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim 11

Dependent claim 11 depends from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest power information displays disposed along an elongated power output face or a power distribution housing that may be mounted adjacent an electrical equipment rack, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein the power distribution housing (i) is elongated, (ii) has an elongated power output face, with the first phase power outputs, the second phase power outputs, and the power information visual display sections disposed along said elongated power output face, and (iii) includes at least one rack mounting section, whereby the power distribution housing may be mounted adjacent an electronic

equipment rack," as recited by dependent claim 11. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claim 12

Dependent claim 12 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "also including (i) a plurality of third phase power outputs disposed in the power distribution housing in power supply communication with a third power phase provided the polyphase power input; and (ii) a third power information visual display section among the plurality of power information visual display sections and associated with the third phase power outputs," as recited by dependent claim 12. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 13

Dependent claim 13 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "also including (i) a plurality of third phase power outputs disposed in the power distribution housing, disposed along the elongated power output face, in power supply communication with a third power phase provided the polyphase power input; and (ii) a third power information visual display section among the plurality of power information visual display sections and associated with the third phase power output," as recited by dependent claim 13. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 13 be withdrawn.

Claim 14

Dependent claim 14 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest any type of current display connected in collective current determining communication with multiple power outputs, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein each among each of said one and said second power information visual display sections comprise a current display section connected in collective current determining communication with the associated plurality of power outputs for the power information visual display section," as recited by dependent claim 14. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15

Dependent claim 15 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral line information display, much less a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein said polyphase power input includes a neutral line and wherein said plurality of power information visual display sections includes a neutral line information display section in communication with the neutral line," as recited by dependent claim 15. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claim 16

Dependent claim 16 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input including a neutral line or a neutral line information display, much less a

polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein said polyphase power input includes a neutral line and wherein said plurality of power information visual display sections also includes a neutral line information display section in current determining communication with the neutral line," as recited by dependent claim 16. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 16 be withdrawn.

Claim 19

Independent claim 19 is directed to a polyphase power distribution apparatus, and comprises a combination of elements, including, for example: "means for displaying information regarding phase one power provided by the plurality of phase one output ports, said phase one displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing" and " means for displaying information regarding phase two power provided by the plurality of phase two output ports while said phase one displaying means displays information regarding phase one power, said phase two displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing."

It is submitted that the combination of Chapel and Kobel, similarly as discussed above, does not render claim 19 obvious. As discussed above, Chapel is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any type of power information visual display sections, let alone the type claimed or within the environment of the power information visual display sections disposed in the power distribution apparatus associated with a plurality of polyphase power outputs, as claimed.

As also discussed above, Chapel and Kobel are not properly combinable, because one of skill in the art, based on the teachings of these references, would not be motivated to combine these references. Furthermore, Chapel actually *teaches away* from visual display of power information.

In addition, similarly as discussed above, the claimed subject matter is allowable because the references fail to teach or suggest the advantages that flow from the claimed invention. The applicants submit that they were the first to discover the underlying problem created by the pre-existing, long-standing need for an operator to have to deal with a single current display along the face of a plugstrip and the time and effort needed to press a display button to see information for each phase, such information only being cycled through and never displayed at the same time. Thus, the applicants then developed the claimed subject matter to provide novel advantages by use of the claimed subject matter (i) to monitor information related to more than one power

phase by looking only at the power distribution housing and (ii) without need for additional equipment of the prior art systems in the claimed environment. It is thus further submitted that the Office Action does not establish *prima facie* obviousness, as it did not consider the applicants' discovery and the advantages as part of the claimed subject matter as a whole. Moreover, as discussed above, since these aspects of the claimed subject matter as a whole are not taught or suggested by the asserted references, the claimed subject matter as a whole is allowable over the references as a matter of law.

Furthermore, similarly as discussed above, Kobel was first published on July 19, 1989 – more than a decade before the applicants' priority date of October 30, 2003. The applicants submit that such a sizeable timeframe, particularly given the rapid pace of technological development in the past twenty years, provides yet further evidence of nonobviousness of the applicants' claimed invention to those skilled in the art.

In sum, claim 19 is allowable because the combination of Chapel and Kobel do not render the claim obvious. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn from independent claim 10 and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim 20

Dependent claim 20 depends from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a housing that includes a vertical rack mounting section, much less a power distribution housing that a power distribution housing that "is elongated, has an elongated side to which the phase one displaying means and phase two displaying means are secured, and includes a vertical rack mounting section, whereby the power distribution apparatus may be vertically mounted adjacent a vertical side of an electronic equipment rack," as recited by dependent claim 20. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 20 be withdrawn.

Claim 21

Dependent claim 21 depends from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power distribution apparatus "including (i) a plurality of phase three output ports disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing, and (ii) means for displaying information regarding phase three power provided by the plurality of phase three output ports, said phase three displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing," as recited by dependent claim 21. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 21 be withdrawn.

Claim 22

Dependent claim 22 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input that includes a neutral line or a neutral line displaying means, much less a polyphase power distribution apparatus "wherein (i) the polyphase power input includes a neutral line and (ii) the polyphase power distribution apparatus also includes means for displaying information regarding the neutral line, said neutral line displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing," as recited by dependent claim 22. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 22 be withdrawn.

Claim 23

Dependent claim 23 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power input that includes a neutral line or a neutral line displaying means, much less a polyphase power distribution apparatus "wherein (i) the polyphase power input includes a neutral

line and (ii) the polyphase power distribution apparatus also includes means for displaying information regarding the neutral line, said neutral line (displaying means being disposed in the power distribution apparatus housing," as recited by dependent claim 23. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 23 be withdrawn.

Claim 24

Dependent claim 24 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel and Kobel, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest any type of sensory alarm, much less a polyphase power distribution apparatus "wherein the phase one displaying means and phase two displaying means each include means for issuing a sensory alarm to a person proximate to the polyphase power distribution apparatus," as recited by dependent claim 24. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 24 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-9, 17-18, and 25-26

Claims 8-9, 17-18, and 25-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapel in view of Kobel, and further in view of U.S. Patent no. 4,528,497 to Arato (hereinafter referred to as "Arato"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8

Dependent claim 8 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kobel, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein each among the plurality of power information visual display sections includes a sensory alarm, whereby a human in the vicinity of the power distribution housing may automatically receive sensory stimulation from said sensory alarm," as recited by dependent claim 8. Accordingly, the

applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claim 9

Dependent claim 9 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 1. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kobel, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein each among the plurality of power information visual display sections includes a sensory alarm, whereby a human in the vicinity of the power distribution housing may automatically receive sensory stimulation from said sensory alarm," as recited by dependent claim 9. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claim 17

Dependent claim 17 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kobel, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein each of the power information visual display sections has an associated sensory alarm," as recited by dependent claim 17. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18

Dependent claim 18 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 10 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 10. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kobel, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase alternating current power distribution apparatus "wherein each of the power information visual display sections has an associated audible alarm," as recited by dependent

claim 18. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 25

Dependent claim 25 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kobel, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power distribution apparatus "wherein each displaying means includes means for issuing a sensory alarm to a person proximate to the polyphase power distribution apparatus," which is recited by dependent claim 25. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 25 be withdrawn.

Claim 26

Dependent claim 26 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 19 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 19. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kobel, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a polyphase power distribution apparatus "wherein each displaying means includes means for issuing an audible alarm to a person proximate to the polyphase power distribution apparatus," which is recited by dependent claim 26. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 26 be withdrawn.

Authorization to charge fees

No claim related fees are believed to be due with this response. In the event any such fees are due, please debit Deposit Account 08-2623.


In the event that a petition for extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136(a) is required to have this reply considered and such a petition does not otherwise accompany this reply, please consider this a petition for an extension of time for the required number of months and authorization to debit Deposit Account 08-2623 for the required fee.

Conclusion

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation will further the prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & HART LLP

By: 
Kenneth C. Winterton
Registration No. 48,040
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201-8749
(303) 473-2700, x2717

Date: Dec. 18, 2007

3806045_1.DOC